

REMARKS

Claims 6-13, 18-26 and 33-45 are in the application, with Claims 6, 18, 33, 40 and 45 having been amended, and with Claims 27 and 28 having been cancelled. Claims 6, 18, 33, 40 and 45 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has thanked for his courtesy in reviewing and discussing applicants' informally submitted proposed claim amendments. The above-noted formal claim amendments are believed to be consistent with our discussion and with the Examiner's suggestions, and are believed to overcome the pending rejections under §§ 112, second paragraph and 101. To summarize the content of the telephone interview with the Examiner conducted on March 20, 2007, it is applicants' understanding that the informally presented claim amendments were sufficient to overcome the pending rejections except as to claim 6. As to claim 6, the Examiner indicated that the rejection under § 112, second paragraph was not fully addressed for lack of a claim element to perform the function of substituting plug-ins for each other. Applicants' representative proposed to add to claim 6 a means plus function limitation parallel to the "substituting" step recited in claim 18, and the Examiner indicated that such an amendment would be satisfactory.

Applicants will now briefly summarize the changes made to each independent claim.

Claim 6:

The claim has been rephrased to positively recite that the second algorithm plug-in is for selectively being implemented in the engine in substitution for the first algorithm plug-in and that the second market plug-in is for selectively being implemented in the engine in substitution for the first market plug-in.

There has been added recitation of “means for substituting either of said second algorithm plug-in or said second market plug-in for either of said first algorithm plug-in or said first market plug-in respectively, in said engine”. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 18 as originally filed.

Claim 6 has also been amended to positively recite that the engine “carr[ies] out trades in accordance with either the first trading strategy or the second trading strategy and in accordance with rules of the first market or the second market”. Support for this amendment is found at page 9, lines 4-12, of the specification of this application.

Claim 18:

As in claim 16, the second algorithm plug-in is now recited to be for selectively being implemented in the engine in substitution for the first algorithm plug-in and the second market plug-in is now recited to be for selectively being implemented in the engine in substitution for the first market plug-in.

Also, there is now positively recited the step of “carrying out trades in accordance with either the first trading strategy or the second trading strategy and in accordance with rules of the first market or the second market”. Support for this amendment is found at page 9, lines 4-12, of the specification of this application.

* * * * *

Further, claims 33, 40, 45 have been rephrased in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions to positively recite carrying out trades.

In view of the claim amendments effected herein, it is respectfully requested that the pending rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is noted that there are no pending rejections in regard to prior art.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

April 20, 2007
Date



Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460